



STAKE

S&H Form: (10/01) 21.1931 Attorney Docket No. 09/339,199 Application Number REPLY/AMENDMENT June 24, 1999 Filing Date FEE TRANSMITTAL Fumiaki NAKATAKE, et al. First Named Inventor Group Art Unit 2774 2674 Kenneth J. Ramsey RECEIVED **Examiner Name** 0.00 AMOUNT ENCLOSED JUL 3 1 2002 FEE CALCULATION (fees effective 10/01/01) Highest Number Number CLAIMS AS Claims Remaining Technology, Center 2600 **AMENDED** Previously Paid For Extra After Amendment Rate 0.00 X\$ 18.00 = **TOTAL CLAIMS** 0 30 30 = 0.00 INDEPENDENT 0 X \$ 84.00 =7 = 7 **CLAIMS** Since an Official Action set an original due date of May 11, 2002, petition is hereby made for an 400.00 extension to cover the date this reply is filed for which the requisite fee is enclosed (1 month (\$110); 2 months (\$400); 3 months (\$920); 4 months (\$1,440); 5 months (\$1,960)): 0.00 If Notice of Appeal is enclosed, add (\$320) If Statutory Disclaimer under Rule 20(d) is enclosed, add fee (\$110) 0.00 400.00 Total of above Calculations = Reduction by 50% for filing by small entity (37 CFR 1.9, 1.27 & 1.28) 400.00 TOTAL FEES DUE = (1) If entry (1) is less than entry (2), entry (3) is "0". **CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)** (2) If entry (2) is less than 20, change entry (2) to "20". I hereby certify that this correspondence is being de-(4) If entry (4) is less than entry (5), entry (6) is "0". posited with the United States Postal Service as first (5) If entry (5) is less than 3, change entry (5) to "3". class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 METHOD OF PAYMENT Check enclosed as payment. Charge "TOTAL FEES DUE" to the Deposit Account No. below.  $\boxtimes$ No payment is enclosed and no charges to the Deposit Account are authorized at this time (unless specifically required to obtain a filing date). **GENERAL AUTHORIZATION** If the above-noted "AMOUNT ENCLOSED" is not correct, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit Ø any overpayment or charge any additional fees necessary to: 19-3935 Deposit Account No. STAAS & HALSEY LLP Deposit Account Name The Commissioner is also authorized to credit any overpayments or charge any additional fees required under  $\boxtimes$ 37 CFR 1.16 (filing fees) or 37 CFR 1.17 (processing fees) during the prosecution of this application, including any related application(s) claiming benefit hereof pursuant to 35 USC § 120 (e.g., continuations/divisionals/CIPs under 37 CFR 1.53(b) and/or continuations/divisionals/CPAs under 37 CFR 1.53(d)) to maintain pendency hereof or of any such related application. SUBMITTED BY: STAAS & HALSEY LLP Typed Name H. J. Staas Reg. No. 22,010

07/23/2002 MGEBREM1 00000014 193935 09339199

01 FC:116

Signature

400.00 CH

ES

July 11,≩2002

©2001 Staas & Halsey

Date



Docket No.: 21.1931

D STATE'S PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:

Fumiaki NAKATAKE, et al.

Serial No. 09/339,199

Group Art Unit: 2774

Confirmation No. 2308

Filed: June 24, 1999

Examiner: Kenneth J. Ramsey

For:

MANUFACTURING METHOD OF PLASMA DISPLAY PANELS

RECEIVED AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR 1.116, WITH PROTEST; AND

JUL 3 1 2002

REQUEST FOR WITHDRAWAL OF FINAL STATUS AS PREMATURE TECHNOlogy Center 2600

**Assistant Commissioner for Patents** Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

This is in response to the FINAL Office Action mailed February 11, 2002, and having a period for response set to expire on May 11, 2002. A Petition for a two-month extension of time, together with the requisite fee for same, is submitted herewith, thereby extending the period for response to July 11, 2002.

The following amendments and remarks are respectfully submitted. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

## REQUEST FOR WITHDRAWAL OF FINAL STATUS OF OFFICE ACTION, AS PREMATURE, UNDER MPEP 706.07(c)-(e)

Applicants respectfully submit that the FINAL status of the subject Office Action is premature and should be withdrawn and such action is earnestly requested.

The reasons in support relate to the reliance on a machine translation of the Seki et al. reference (see discussion below in relation to item 4 of the Office Action) and the reliance on a portion of Seki et al. not relied upon heretofore in the prosecution, also discussed below in relation to item 4 of the Office Action.